

## REMARKS

### Status of Claims

Claims 1-5 and 20-26 are previously-presented claims. Claim 27 has been added. Reconsideration of the rejections of all claims and allowance are earnestly solicited in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

### Substance of the Interview

Applicants thank examiner Smith for granting and conducting the personal interview on January 11, 2006 and for considering the arguments for allowance. Applicants submit that the prior art, including Saunders, Maslov and Froessl, fails to teach or suggest a property attached to a position in the document, where the property preserves original raw data. The property corresponding to the document is permanently associated within a range of the document.

### Rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,499 to Saunders (hereinafter “Saunders”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,240 to Maslov (hereinafter “Maslov”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,109,439 to Froessl (hereinafter “Froessl”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The prior art, including Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to teach or suggest, among other things “attaching a property to the document in at least one position in the document, wherein the property preserves originally entered data.”

Saunders discloses a text services manager that controls interactions between text services and an application. See U.S. Patent No. 5,946,499 (issued Aug. 31, 1999) col. 3, ll.20-35. The text services filter input device events that are passed to the application. *Id. at 36-42.* The text services perform functions and interact with the user on behalf of the application. *Id.* The application interacts with the text services through a TSMDocument data structure, which includes the TSMContext, a locale object and a SOM object. *Id. at col. 4, ll. 20-30.* The TSM document is destroyed when the text service operations are complete. *Id. at col. 4, ll. 20-27.* The TSMContext enables a text service to reserve a

portion of the document utilizing a unique identifier, an owner and a range. The TSMcontext including the unique identifier allows the service to manipulate the specified region. *Id. at col. 7, ll. 1-30.*

Maslov discloses a method to build or transform programs or scripts using a graphical user interface. U.S. Patent No. 6,466,240 (issued Oct. 15, 2002) col. 1, ll.1-15. Maslov further discloses structured text is changed by manipulating a visual tree representation using graphical commands, such as copy and paste. *Id. at col. 2, ll. 40-45.* The tree is displayed in a first window that is synchronized with a second window displaying the structured text corresponding to the tree: if a tree node is selected by a user in the first window, the fragment of the structured text in the second window is highlighted. *Id. at col. 3, ll. 35-45.*

Froessl discloses a storage and retrieval system that scans words and relates them to scanned documents. U.S. Patent No. 5,109,439 (issued Apr. 28, 1992) col. 1, ll.5-10. The documents are scanned and converted to code (Ascii) and an image of the document is stored in volatile memory. *Id. at col. 7, ll. 55-65.* The system then flags an identification number associated with the document if a conversion problem occurs. *Id. at col. 8, ll. 1-10.* Furthermore, Froessl discloses storing the image and full text conversion. *Id. at col. 8, ll. 24-30.*

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action attempts to reconstruct the claimed invention from the disclosures of Saunders, Maslov and Froessl. Each reference is directed to a different field of endeavor and attempts to solve a different problem. The Office Action presents a piecemeal analysis of the claimed invention and fails to teach or suggest all claimed limitations of the invention.

The Office Action construes the unique identifier disclosed by Saunders to be a property that is modifiable to preserve the original raw data. This modification however would be in operable because Saunders, in col. 4, ll. 10-30, discloses that the TSM document data structure which includes the reference to the range is destroyed. Accordingly, the original raw data can not be preserved and the Saunders reference can not be modified by Froessl without destroying the disclosed operations of the Saunders reference.

Unlike the prior art, Saunders, Maslov and Froessl, embodiments of the invention preserves the original raw data by utilizing a range object to attach the original raw data to the specified range in the document. Furthermore, the text services, provide text input and not original raw input to the application.

Moreover, the references Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to suggest or provide a motivation for combining the references. Furthermore, the references teach away from the claimed invention because Froessl fails to provide attaching the original raw data at the range specified by a range object. Finally, when evaluating the scope of a claim, every limitation in the claim must be considered. The Office may not dissect the claimed invention into discrete elements and then evaluate the elements in isolation. See MPEP 2106(II)(C) (2005). Accordingly, for at least the forgoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the prior art, and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claim 1 should withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and new claim 27 depend on claim 1 and further defines novel features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claims 2-5 and 27 are allowable over the prior art.

**Rejection of claims 20, 21 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 20, 21 and 22-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saunders in view of Froessl. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The prior art, including Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to teach or suggest, among other things “attaching a property in the document at range specified in the range object, the property providing access to original raw data.”

With respect to claims 20 and 23, the Office Action construes the unique identifier disclosed by Saunders to be a property that is modifiable to preserve the original raw data. This modification however would be in operable because Saunders in col. 4, ll. 10-30 discloses that the TSM document data structure which includes the reference to the range is destroyed. Moreover, the unique identifier is a 32-bit number not related to original raw data. The unique identifier enables the text service to be associated with a reserved portion. Accordingly, the original raw data is not preserved by the unique identifier, and the Saunders reference can not be modified by Froessl without destroying the disclosed operation of the Saunders reference.

Unlike the prior art, Saunders, Maslov and Froessl, embodiments of the invention preserve the original raw data by utilizing a range object to attach the original raw data to that specified range in the document. Furthermore, the text services, provide text input and not original raw input to the application.

Moreover, the references Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to suggest or provide a motivation for combining the references, and the references teach away from the claimed invention because Froessl fails to provide attaching the original raw data at the range specified by a range object by utilizing a property. Finally, when evaluating the scope of a claim, every limitation in the claim must be considered. The Office may not dissect the claimed invention into discrete elements and then evaluate the elements in isolation. See MPEP 2106(II)(C) (2005). Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 20 and 23 are allowable over the prior art, and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 20 and 23 should withdrawn.

Claims 21-22 and 24-26 depend on claim 20 and 23 and further defines novel features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20 and 23, claims 21-22 are allowable over the prior art.

New dependent claim 27 depends on claim 1 and further defines the attached property to be permanently, that is non-volatilly, associated with the document. Accordingly, dependent claim 27 is allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

**CONCLUSION**

As set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue. Should, however, any issues remain prior to issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.87507.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2006

  
Monplaisir Hamilton  
Reg. No. 54,851

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
Phone: (816) 474-6550  
Facsimile (816) 421-5547